

REMARKS

1. Claims 1, 2, 6-40, and 45-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boesen (U.S. Patent No. 5,542,721) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,595) and Tomura (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,992).

Independent Claim 1

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection to Claim 1 for reasons presented. Claim 1 states:

a second segment moveably coupled to the first segment to move primarily along one axis without pivoting, between a contracted position and an extended position, wherein an overall length of the mobile device is (i) maximized when the second segment is in the extended position and (ii) minimized when the second segment is moved towards the contracted position as compared to when the second segment is in the extended position;

Thus, Claim 1 requires the second segment to move *without pivot* in order for the housing segment to attain both the *maximum* and *minimum* lengths. This is not taught by Boesen. Specifically, Boesen does provide a slider housing that can be manipulated without pivot in order to attain maximum and minimum lengths, the Boesen housing must pivot. Applicant makes reference to Page 3 of the Final Office Action from July 2008, which states:

Boesen includes a pivotable mechanism to allow the user to adjust the angle between the first segment and second segment. However, this function is only for enabling the user to use the device in a manner as a phone handset, and the pivoting operation is performed after the sliding operation, wherein the pivotable mechanism is operative independently from the operation of the sliding operation. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to operate the device without the pivoting motion since it merely depends on the user's preference on the angle and length of the device. Boesen teaches a set of input mechanisms (22) in the second

Applicant respectfully notes that even if the pivot mechanisms of Boesen are independent of the slider mechanisms, Boesen requires the pivot in order to achieve the maximum and minimum housing lengths. This falls short of teaching the claimed element, which requires the maximum and minimum positions to be attainable without pivot. Thus, assuming *in arguendo*, that Boesen (i) has a housing segment that has a maximum and minimum length, and (ii) that it utilizes a slider construction to achieve the maximum and minimum positions, Boesen would still fail to teach the recited feature because Boesen requires pivot in order to attain the maximum/minimum lengths for the housing segment.

Independent Claim 19

Claim 19 has been amended to recite:

a second segment slideably coupled to the first segment to move between a contracted position and an extended position, wherein an overall width of the mobile device is (i) maximized when the second segment is in the extended position, and (ii) minimized when the second segment is in the contracted position, so that the overall width of the mobile device is reduced when the second segment is moved towards the contracted position from the extended position; and

a set of one or more input mechanisms provided on the second segment so as to be exposed when the second segment is in the extended position and not when in the contracted position.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art provided do not teach or suggest such widthwise moveability of the housing segments. Support for the amendment may be found on portions of the Specification that include Page 21, lines 19-23.

Independent Claim 27

With regard to Independent Claim 27, Applicant repeats the remarks made above with Claim 1. Applicant further requests reconsideration in view of the amendment:

wherein the housing assembly is structured to fully expose a reduced section that has a reduced peripheral thickness in connection with the first housing segment and the second housing segment being moved linearly and without pivot

The reduced section is thus provided to be fully exposed as a result of the linear and non-pivoting motion of the two housing segments. Thus, assuming in arguendo that Examiner's interpretation of Boesen is correct, Boesen still does not teach fully exposing the reduced section through linear movement.

Independent Claim 45

Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection to Claim 45 for reasons that include those stated with Independent Claim 1 and Claim 20. As stated with remarks of Claim 1 and elsewhere, Boesen does not teach enabling the housing segments to be moved to positions of maximum length and width without pivot. As stated with Claim 20, extending and contracting the housing segments of the mobile computing device is differentiable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION


A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any questions or comments that the Examiner wishes to direct to Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at (408) 551-6632.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1914.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEMWELL MAHAMEDI LLP

Date: 10/19/08


Van Mahamedi, Reg. No. 42,828
Tel. 408-236-6640